PPSS POLICY AND PROGRAM STUDIES SERVICE

Partnerships for Reform: Changing Teacher Preparation through the Title II HEA Partnership Program

Interim Report
Executive Summary

2004

Partnerships for Reform:
Changing Teacher Preparation
through the Title II HEA Partnership Program

Interim Report
Executive Summary

Prepared for
U.S. Department of Education
Office of the Under Secretary
Policy and Program Studies Service

American Institutes for Research
SRI International

2004

U.S. Department of Education
Rod Paige
Secretary

Office of the Under Secretary
Eugene Hickok
Under Secretary

Policy and Program Studies Service
Alan L. Ginsburg
Director

Program and Analytic Studies Division
David Goodwin
Director

March 2004

To order copies of this report,

write to: ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398;

or **fax** your request to: (301) 470-1244;

or **email**, send your request to: edpubs@inet.ed.gov

or **call** in your request toll-free: 1-877-433-7827 (1-877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 1-800-872-5327 (1-800-USA-LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY) should call 1-800-437-0833.

or **order online** at: www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html.

This report is available on the Department's Web site at: http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/ppss/index.html. On request, this publication is also available in alternative formats, such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at (202) 260-9895 or (202) 205-8113.

Contents

Exhibits

Executive Summary

Purpose of the Title II HEA Partnerships

The issue of teacher qualifications has been an important one throughout our country's history. In local, state and national conversations, parents and the public have struggled with questions of quantity and quality: Do we have enough teachers, and do the teachers we have represent the best we can provide for our children? Policy makers have searched for the best ways to encourage states and institutions of higher education to focus on and improve the qualifications of teachers through various incentive programs for the past 25 years. Although the teacher preparation community has progressed as it responds to concerns and mandates at the beginning of the 21st century, the issues of quantity and quality remain unresolved.

The Title II Partnership Grant Program was created during the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in 1998 to give an additional boost to the preparation of well-qualified teachers. Recent studies, such as those by William Sanders in Tennessee, suggest that teachers play a significant role in improving student achievement in the classroom. The approach selected for the Partnership Grant Program—the formation of partnerships among schools of education, schools of arts and sciences and local school districts—was seen as a way of bringing K–12 schools and other stakeholders (business and cultural institutions) further into the decision-making process concerning teacher quality. At the time, many teacher preparation programs were already collaborating with local schools to improve curriculum offerings and clinical experience. However, the framers of the Title II legislation believed that a formal partnership structure, with K–12 schools as partners in the preservice teacher preparation experience, would serve as an important reality check for faculty and administrators at institutions of higher education (IHEs): when sitting across from the schools at the decision-making table, colleges and universities cannot deny the need of schools for high-quality teachers. The legislation provided funds to Partnerships specifically to reform teacher preparation programs, improve clinical experience for students during their internship and enhance the professional development opportunities available to in-service teachers.

The ultimate goal of the program is to improve student achievement by increasing the quality of teachers. The Title II Partnership Grant Program's emphasis on content training for teachers, intensive clinical training, support for new teachers and intensive professional development experiences is in line with and supportive of the teacher-quality goals and priorities of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. This Evaluation examines the extent to which the Partnership Program has improved teacher quality.

Key findings from the Evaluation's first Interim Report are highlighted in this executive summary. Data were collected during the years 2001-2003, addressing the first 2 years of Partnership grantee activities.

Key Findings

The first Partnership grantees to receive competitive funds were the 25 Partnership projects in the 1999 cohort. These grantees received $175 million over the 5 years of the project, at an average of $7 million each year.

By forming a Partnership, education institutions attempt to reach more broadly into the communities they serve: As one indicator of the scope of the Partnerships, more than 14,000 preservice teaching students and more than 13,000 current teachers and instructional specialists are reported to be involved in Partnership activities (see exhibit 1).

Exhibit 1
Number of People and Institutions Directly and Actively Involved
in Partnership Activities and Projects

Partnership Participants	*Number*
Institutional Partners[1]	
Schools	1,137
School districts	183
2-year colleges	24
4-year colleges and universities	64
Institutional Partners Total	**1,408**
Individual Partners[2]	
University faculty members[3]	1,814
Teachers, instructional specialists, and instructional leaders benefiting from professional development activities	13,780
District-level staff	1,893
School-level staff	6,152
Preservice teaching students	14,041
Individual Partners Total	**37,680**

[1] As reported in project proposals.

[2] As reported in surveys by respondents; underestimates actual totals because not every district, school, or university department in all Partnerships responded to our survey.

[3] Includes 1,035 faculty from schools of education and 779 faculty from arts and sciences.

EXHIBIT READS: 1,137 schools were reported as partners by the 25 Title II Partnerships in this evaluation.

SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Surveys of Project Directors, School Districts and Faculty

Other key findings include:

- One of the main ways school district and school instructional staff have participated in the Title II Partnerships, thus far, is by enrolling in summer institutes sponsored by the Partnerships in reading instruction, mathematics and science. School partners also serve as mentors for new teachers and supervisors for student interns, participate in workshops on the use of technology and enroll in master's programs delivered directly to their school by university partners using distance-learning technology developed with Partnership funds.

- To improve supervision of early field experiences and student teaching internships, 72 percent of Partnerships have selected the Professional Development School (PDS) model of teacher preparation. This model involves education faculty maintaining a weekly presence in partner schools assisting teachers and teacher education students. It is also a vehicle for involving teachers from the partner school in planning and teaching preparation courses.

- Faculty in education programs have invested Title II resources in induction support programs for new graduates who are teaching in partner schools. Resources are funding induction support networks, summer institutes and continuing coursework to improve the retention of new graduates who are fully qualified teachers.

- Increased communication between universities and schools in Partnerships facilitates a closer match between teacher preparation and school instruction needs, as evidenced by close agreement on the readiness of new teachers to handle curriculum and instruction challenges. For example, both school and faculty respondents to Title II surveys rate new teacher preparation highly in the areas of working with a diverse population of learners and in the use of a variety of instructional strategies.

- Title II Partnership Projects are monitoring the student achievement in partner schools and gathering data on the contribution of professional development and Partnership organizational changes to student achievement and school climate in partner schools. Several Partnerships have made this a component of their internal evaluations.

- The composition of Title II Partnerships varies in important ways. Some Partnerships include as few as 1 district and as many as 29. Partnerships may include as few as 3 schools and as many as 131.

In addition, the Title II Partnership Evaluation will, by the end of the fourth year, be able to track changes in student achievement scores at the school level over the years of collaboration with university partners. The scores of Title II partners will be compared with those of non-Title II partner schools. In an initial review of scores during the second year of the grants, schools in Title II Partnerships were very similar to schools that are not participating in this federal program.

Title II Partnership Projects have faced many barriers to achieving their goals: poor economic conditions in school districts, intransigence of school and academic cultures; partnership arrangements that hinder progress and the high numbers of teachers they are seeking to help. Yet continued efforts to assess K–12 school needs and the performance of their preparation program graduates are leading Partnership IHEs to expand their expectations for teacher preparation students, to incorporate extensive field experiences in required courses and to extend and support the clinical experience for student interns with a specially trained clinical supervisor or mentor teacher.

Evaluation Topics and Data Collection Activities

This Evaluation addresses how well the Partnerships are implementing required activities and achieving the program goals. Linking the project activities and program goals is made possible through the conceptualization of five evaluation topics:

- Characteristics of high-quality preservice teacher preparation and changes to the content and structure of the preservice teacher preparation program over the grant period.

- Contributions of Partnership grants to schools and school districts and schools' and districts' roles in preservice teacher preparation.

- The association between collaborative activities among partner IHEs and schools and student achievement outcomes.

- Organizational changes and relationships among partners within a grant.

- Efforts to institutionalize Partnerships.

The Evaluation uses eight data sources in this Interim Report to examine the evaluation topics listed above:

- A targeted literature review describing various theoretical criteria that can be used to evaluate the quality of teacher preparation programs.

- Year 2000 Institutional Accountability Reports from each IHE in the Partnerships with a teacher preparation program ("report cards" required by the 1998 Higher Education Act Amendments [§ 207]).

- Year 2000 Annual Performance Reports that provide information on how the Partnerships are doing in terms of the performance measures established by the U.S. Department of Education under the Government Performance and Results Act.

- A one-time survey of project directors that collects data on the content and structure of each teacher preparation program associated with the Partnership, organizational changes and relationships among partners and efforts to institutionalize Partnerships.

- The first (a baseline) of two surveys of partner faculty members from both schools of education and schools of arts and sciences describing faculty collaboration, faculty involvement in reform of teacher preparation and the institutionalization of Partnership activities.

- The first (a baseline) of two surveys of representatives from partner school districts describing interactions among partners, changes in teacher preparation and efforts towards institutionalization of Partnership activities and district-level activities.

- Exploratory site visits to collect qualitative, contextual information on the design and implementation of four Partnerships.

- School-level student achievement data derived from an extant data file compiled by the Policy and Program Studies Service at the U.S. Department of Education (data will be used to assess associations between Partnership activities and student achievement).

Descriptive findings from the Interim Report are presented below, addressing the five evaluation topics.

How Are Title II Partnership Projects Reforming Teacher Preparation Programs?

Faculty Collaboration

In general, most teacher preparation programs balance components of academic content study and pedagogy studies, although collaboration on the details of course design and student expectations seldom occurs across departments. To change these practices, the Partnership projects facilitate collaboration between schools of education and schools of arts and sciences at the same IHE.

Modest gains have been made in this area through Partnerships: two-thirds of faculty respondents to the Title II baseline surveys reported that collaboration among arts and sciences and education faculty took place in the 2000–01 school year. This collaboration has resulted in integrated education and content area courses, discipline-based workshops that build teachers' knowledge of content-based instructional strategies and continuing seminars that build and extend teachers' knowledge of generalizable instructional approaches.

The most common venues for collaboration across schools of education and arts and sciences are committees to work on project goals, meetings to discuss preservice students and meetings to learn about teacher preparation and program development. Faculty from both the education and arts and science schools involved in Partnership projects tend to participate at the same level and in the same kinds of activities. Exhibit 2 shows the overall pattern of responses for faculty from both schools.

Exhibit 2
Faculty Involvement in Collaborative Partnership Activities

Collaborative Activity	Number Participating	Percent of Total Participating	Hours of Involvement (2000-01)			
			Mean	SD	Median	Mode
Participating in committees to work on project goals	105	58.3	26.8	33.8	20	10
Meeting to discuss teacher education students	113	37.2	21.1	30.3	12	20
Meeting to learn more about teacher education	99	55.0	20.9	28.7	15	10
Developing teacher preparation program	91	49.4	37.6	76.9[3]	15	10
Coordinating course offerings	78	43.3	23.8	40.1	10	5
Planning future courses	78	43.3	19.6	29.0	10	10
Implementing management team	70	38.9	50.8	139.3[3]	20	10
Jointly advising teacher education students	62	34.4	22.1	30.3	14	20
Revising existing courses	54	30.0	29.3	39.6	18	10
Jointly observing teacher education students	44	24.4	27.7	37.7	15	10
Co-teaching or team teaching[1]	23	12.8	49.7	66.9	20	10
Co-teaching or team teaching[2]	24	13.3	38.3	39.0	20	10

[1]Education faculty teaching at arts and sciences.
[2]Arts and Sciences faculty teaching at education.
[3]These standard deviations are high because a few faculty respondents reported large numbers of hours of involvement. In program development collaboration, one faculty member spent 1,000 hours, another 600 hours and all other respondents 200 or fewer hours. In management team collaboration, one faculty member spent 500 hours, another 400 hours and all other respondents 200 or fewer hours.
EXHIBIT READS: This table describes the variety of ways in which education and arts and sciences faculty work on behalf of the Partnership Project; for example, 105 faculty across all projects reported participating in committees to work on project goals.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Faculty Surveys

Many faculty members report participating in more than one of these activities. Exhibit 2 indicates that the highest percentage participation is in committee attendance and membership, activities reflective of the goals of early Partnership formation. Partnerships are seeking a more comprehensive change in the nature of the relationship between education and arts and science faculty. The Evaluation expects to document whether this kind of change occurs and is sustained.

Faculty and School Collaboration

School districts and schools also reported participating in collaborative activities with partner colleges and universities, specifically in those areas relating to teacher preparation reform, clinical experiences and professional development (see exhibit 3).

Exhibit 3
School and District Personnel Involvement in Collaborative Partnership Activities
with Partner Colleges or Universities

Collaborative Activity	*Percent*
Serve as mentors for new teachers	94
Collaborate on the delivery of professional development activities	76
Redesign field experience	65
Redesign classroom observations during student teaching	61
Work on diversity issues with preservice students	60
Develop, improve and use tools to assess student teachers' performance	56
Participate on K-12 restructuring teams	54
Recruit students for teacher preparation programs	50
Redesign preservice course sequence	38
Develop standards and proficiency levels for licensure of programs	25
Present to relevant IHE classes	23

EXHIBIT READS: 94 percent of respondents to the school district survey indicated they served as mentors for new teachers as part of their involvement with their local Partnership Project.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline School District Survey

Faculty Instruction with Technology

The majority of Partnership projects are meeting technology integration goals by developing a preservice capacity for technology integration with preservice teaching students and K–12 teachers, by enhancing the technology in K–12 classrooms and by preparing faculty to use technology in their classrooms. In fact, 82 percent of the Partnerships reported that they use Title II funds to support technology in their preservice education programs. Partnership participants reported that the resources allotted for technology integration from their Partnership grant helped to develop student expertise in lesson planning by using multimedia applications, supported student development by using electronic portfolios and assisted faculty in modeling technology integration in pedagogy courses. Demonstrating the importance of providing technology assistance to K–12 schools, 59 percent of the Partnerships had secured funds for this purpose from other community organizations or grant programs prior to receiving the Title II grant. The Partnership Evaluation did not request information from Partnerships regarding the leveraging or combining of these resources.

Faculty members in Title II partner institutions report a high level of technology use in six areas (see exhibit 4).

Exhibit 4
Faculty Members' Strategies for Teaching with Technology

Instructional Strategies for Teaching Technology	Percent
Providing training to teacher education students on using technology as a tool for communication, research or problem solving or to obtain teaching materials or create curricula	88
Providing training to teacher education students on using technology for communication (e.g., Internet)	85
Enhancing faculty members' technological knowledge and skills through workshops, summer institutes, mentoring with technology-proficient K–12 teachers, online learning or hands-on classroom experiences that focus on using technology	85
Disseminating technology resources (articles, online help, discussion groups) via the Web to teacher education students	82
Using e-mail and listservs to interact with students in teacher education courses	79
Using videos, CDs or the Web to demonstrate case studies of exemplary classrooms to teacher education students	74

EXHIBIT READS: 88 percent of respondents to the faculty surveys reported providing training to teacher education students on using technology as a tool for communication, research or problem solving or to obtain teaching materials or create curricula.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Faculty Surveys

Accountability for Student Outcomes

As Title II Partnerships address the issue of teacher quality, they have taken steps to develop internal processes to monitor education students' outcomes. These steps include increased reliance on feedback from partner schools and school districts and more formalized assessment of education students and program outcomes as a whole. Partner IHEs are assessing the transfer of knowledge from teacher education program to classroom practice; 77 percent of responding Partnerships reported using two or more types of assessments to determine how well graduates are doing in new teaching assignments.

Although all Partnerships have goals of improving student achievement in their partner districts, plans for addressing these and other district needs rely more heavily on informal communication and Partnership committees as the means of gathering advice from districts rather than on formal needs assessments of the alignment of teacher preparation programs with district needs. A small percentage of Partnerships (22 percent) report conducting assessments or analyzing assessment data to highlight district needs; the remaining Partnerships do neither.

How Are Partnership Projects Improving Professional Development for Partner Schools and School Districts?

Professional Development Activities

Partnerships are addressing the needs of schools and school districts for professional development to increase the competencies of in-service teachers (teachers with full-time assignments in partner schools) in core instructional areas. Partnerships have involved more teachers in decisions about and delivery of professional development and in collaborative activities with faculty to address the needs of preservice students and beginning teachers. Professional development in the form of induction programs to mentor new teachers is probably the largest investment being made to retain qualified teachers in partner schools. To date, 13,780 teachers and instructional specialists and leaders in schools are reported to have benefited from professional development activities attributable to Title II Partnerships.

- 93 percent of school district survey respondents reported about the professional development opportunities made possible through the Partnerships, with an average participation of 46 staff members per activity.

- The most common professional development activities include higher education workshops, district workshops, conferences, college credit courses and committees or task forces. Common topics are working with students with diverse learning needs, mentoring or supervising student teachers, assessing student teachers and instructing teachers to use technology.

New Teacher Support

Even before receiving the Title II Partnership grants, districts supported new teachers: 83 percent of the districts provided routine observations, 75 percent provided formal mentoring by veteran teachers, 63 percent provided informal mentoring and 31 percent provided seminars with faculty for new teachers. However, these support activities were not formalized with the university partner responsible for the new teacher graduates until implementation of the Partnership grants.

Participating in the Title II Partnership Grant Program has increased new teacher support provided by districts and IHEs. Education deans participating in the leadership of the Partnership projects described the involvement and commitment of the preservice teacher preparation program to the ongoing training and support of new teachers. These deans enumerated the forms of new teacher support, both by districts and IHEs, among the Title II Partnership projects (see exhibit 5).

Exhibit 5
Induction Activities Provided by Partnerships as Reported by Education Deans

	Percent reporting that:			*Average length of time the activity is available (in months)*
Induction Activity	*activity was provided to new graduates*	*activity supported by IHE faculty*	*school or district staff supported the activity*	
General access to teacher preparation IHE faculty for questions or discussion	91	88	12	25
Teacher preparation program-sponsored network or support group with other program graduates	54	82	18	19
Organized mentoring program	77	36	64	26
Continuing education through teacher education program coursework	80	79	21	25
Continuing education through program workshops or seminars	86	61	39	19

EXHIBIT READS: 91 percent of faculty Deans surveyed reported that general access to teacher preparation faculty for questions or discussion was provided to new graduates as an induction activity by Partnerships.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Faculty Survey

How Are Partnership Projects Changing the Requirements and Quality of the Clinical Experience for Preservice Teachers?

Professional Development Schools

Seventy-two percent of the Partnerships have chosen to base their increased interaction with school partners in the PDS, a collaborative arrangement to address the needs of preservice and in-service teacher preparation. Respondents to the Title II Partnership Evaluation surveys indicated that the PDS arrangement was the most commonly used model to change the quality of the clinical experience for student internships.

In PDSs, student interns are supported by professors-in-residence (PIRs) from the university partners who are on-site at least one day a week as a visible commitment to link teacher preparation theory with practice. The presence of PIRs ensures communication about student supervision between the IHE and the school. The PIR also facilitates detailed and systematic supervision by cooperating teachers and clinical supervisors. Partnership teacher preparation programs have led the way in training in-service teachers to become clinical supervisors by incorporating the principles of adult education and supervision. The impact on schools has led to improved status and recognition for teachers who mentor the newest members of their profession.

Student Internships

Typically, student interns from Partnership IHEs spend up to 20 weeks in a student internship, sometimes divided into two periods in different schools. Only 22 percent of Partnership teacher preparation programs require fewer than 15 weeks of student teaching activity, 74 percent require 15 to 20 weeks and 4 percent require more than 20 weeks.

Matched Expectations

Increased interaction between faculty in IHEs and K–12 schools seems to result in a closer match of expectations regarding what new teachers know and can do. Faculty and school district partners responding to the same set of issues indicated that overall, teacher preparation students are "adequately" to "very well" prepared to face the school challenges listed, choosing "not at all" prepared less than 15 percent of the time. Respondents indicated that students are best prepared to work with diverse populations of learners and to use a variety of instructional strategies and least (but still adequately) prepared to communicate with parents and to work with special education students (see exhibit 6).

Exhibit 6
Perceptions of Faculty and School District Respondents
Regarding New Teachers' Preparedness

Area of new teacher preparedness	Average Score Faculty	Average Score School District
Working with diverse populations of learners	4.4	4.2
Using a variety of instructional strategies	4.3	4.3
Applying standards to classroom lessons	4.2	4.3
Learning how to be a learner	4.1	4.0
Using a variety of assessment strategies	4.0	4.0
Developing a depth in subject matter knowledge	3.9	3.9
Knowing how to construct curricula	3.9	3.7
Conducting effective classroom management	3.8	4.2
Communicating with parents	3.6	3.7
Working in a school with structural reform initiatives (e.g., year-round schools, block scheduling, school restructuring teams)	3.6	3.7
Knowing how to work with special education students	3.5	3.6

NOTE: Respondents were asked to rate new teacher preparedness on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very well).
EXHIBIT READS: On average, faculty and school district respondents rated new teacher preparedness with regards to working with diverse populations of learners as 4.4 and 4.2, respectively on a five-point scale.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Faculty and School District Surveys

How Are Partnership Activities with School Districts and Schools Affecting Student Performance on State Achievement Assessments?

"High-Need" School Partners

Title II Partnership collaborations start at the district level where their mandate is to focus on "high-need" school districts. One expectation of this collaboration is a measurable improvement in school-level student achievement scores because specific activities undertaken throughout the district or with individual schools eventually raise the quality of teaching within partner schools.

The Partnership Evaluation is seeking an indication of the difference made to schools and school districts through Partnership participation. This difference is being measured by comparing student achievement scores of Title II and non-Title II schools in the same or similar districts within a state.

Before the analysis of differences could be undertaken, a baseline descriptive analysis was conducted to determine how alike Title II and non-Title II schools were as the grant began.

According to the Common Core of Data and the PPSS School-level Assessment Database, Title II schools closely resemble non-Title II schools on a number of key characteristics that are associated with "high need." Exhibit 7 illustrates that Title II partner schools have slightly higher enrollments; but on all other selected characteristics, including Title I status, percent of student body that is minority, average percent eligible for free and reduced-price school lunch and school-level achievement in reading and math, they are similar. Exhibit 7 is a summary table; more detailed tables are provided in the full report comparing Title II and non-Title II schools on each characteristic. See exhibit 8 for details about the baseline achievement scores.

Exhibit 7
Descriptive Characteristics of Title II and Non-Title II Schools in the Partnerships,
2000–01

Average	*Title II Schools*	*Non-Title II Schools*	*Difference*
% Title I	73.9	69.4	4.5
% Minority	55.4	56.3	-0.9
% Free- or Reduced-Price Lunch	47.7	50.7	-3.1
Enrollment	536.2	465.8	70.4
Standardized Math Score	95.9	96.0	-0.1
Standardized Reading Scores	94.4	95.3	-0.6

NOTE: The overall average is an unweighted average across all Partnerships so that all Partnerships are treated equally. While the averages are presented here, the breakdowns by Partnership are included in exhibits 22 –24 and Appendix F of the full report. We did not test for significance of the overall average differences reported here, however, significant differences are indicated at the Partnership level in exhibits 22-24 and Appendix F of the full report.
EXHIBIT READS: On average, 73.9 percent of Title II schools also qualify as Title I schools, while 69.4 percent of Non-Title II schools qualify as Title I schools.
SOURCE: CCD, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education and School-Level Assessment Database, American Institutes for Research, John C. Flanagan Research Center (2001). Funded by the Policy and Program Studies Service, U.S. Department of Education

Baseline Student Achievement Scores

One component of the Partnership Evaluation will be an examination of the associations that might exist between the types of collaborative activities sponsored by Partnerships and student achievement.[1] This analysis, using data from a survey of principals in the Title II Partnerships and extant school-level student achievement data for multiple years, will appear in the final report. Since this interim report addresses only the first two years of the Partnership grant, just one year of baseline achievement scores for math and reading assessments is available as a baseline measure. These baseline math and reading scores from 2000-01 are shown in exhibit 8 for the Title II and non-Title II schools in partner districts.

Each row of exhibit 8 represents a Partnership. The math and reading scores are sorted by average math difference. For both math and reading, only one Partnership differed significantly for Title II and non-Title II schools.

---

[1] Appendix F in the Interim Report describes the methodology for analyses of the achievement data. The goal of the student achievement analysis was to compare schools within districts and then within Partnerships. Because student achievement data differed substantially across states, we chose not to aggregate across states. In most cases, the Partnership level was equivalent to the state level, however, there was one Partnership that was multistate in scope. In addition, there was one Partnership that did not work with any school-level partners in the first two years of the grant period. Therefore, in the exhibits related to Evaluation Topic 3 (student achievement) where each row represents a Partnership, there are more rows than Partnerships.

Exhibit 8
Average Math and Reading Scores for Title II and
Non-Title II Schools, 2000–01

Partnership	Math			Reading		
	Title II Schools (n)	Non-Title II Schools (n)	Difference	Title II Schools (n)	Non-Title II Schools (n)	Difference
25	97.8 (2)	88.3 (11)	9.6	91.9 (2)	84.5 (11)	7.4
24	112.4 (7)	104.2 (17)	8.2	109.0 (7)	104.3 (17)	4.7
5	96.3 (13)	90.6 (1)	5.7	95.8 (13)	86.2 (1)	9.6
2	101.4 (112)	98.6 (18)	2.9	99.8 (112)	100.9 (17)	-1.1
4	92.3 (8)	89.5 (143)	2.8	92.2 (8)	90.5 (142)	1.7
6	98.6 (71)	96.4 (457)	2.2	95.6 (71)	93.9 (457)	1.7
27	83.8 (7)	81.7 (21)	2.1	85.4 (7)	83.1 (21)	2.2
15	92.3 (5)	90.5 (19)	1.8	93.1 (5)	91.5 (19)	1.6
19	103.3 (42)	101.9 (262)	1.4	102.2 (42)	101.4 (262)	0.8
13	95.3 (32)	94.3 (25)	1.1	93.7 (32)	93.7 (25)	0.0
8	97.6 (99)	96.6 (142)	1.0	95.2 (99)	94.1 (142)	1.1
14	99.6 (6)	98.8 (23)	0.8	98.6 (6)	98.0 (23)	0.6
20	105.0 (5)	104.5 (35)	0.6	106.5 (5)	105.5 (35)	1.0
9	95.0 (12)	94.7 (42)	0.4	89.7 (12)	93.5 (42)	-3.9
3	102.3 (10)	102.4 (78)	-0.1	102.0 (10)	103.1 (77)	-1.1
22	104.9 (3)	105.2 (7)	-0.3	98.8 (3)	98.4 (7)	0.4
11	89.6 (6)	91.8 (206)	-2.3	88.9 (6)	90.8 (206)	-1.8
12	99.1 (41)	101.5 (99)	-2.3	95.5 (41)	97.7 (99)	-2.2
10	79.9 (12)	83.1 (133)	-3.2		no reading data available	
21	89.9 (8)	94.6 (86)	-4.7	89.9 (8)	93.7 (86)	-3.8
23	99.4 (4)	104.4 (3)	-5.0		no reading data available	
1	89.1 (3)	97.4 (90)	-8.3	86.3 (3)	95.1 (91)	-8.8
18	80.0 (8)	97.1 (38)	-17.1**	79.2 (8)	101.7 (38)	-22.5**
7	95.9 (45)	–	–	98.1 (45)	–	–
16	98.3 (60)	–	–	100.8 (50)	–	–
17	98.0 (8)	–	–	99.7 (8)	–	–
26	80.2 (114)	–	–	80.9 (114)	–	–
Average	**95.9**	**96.0**	**-.13**	**94.4**	**95.3**	**-.58**

* p<.05, **p<.01.
– Not applicable, Partnerships are working with all the schools in their partner districts; therefore, no non-Title II schools exist for comparison.
NOTE: Achievement scores are standardized to a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15 within each grade and then averaged to the school, state and Partnership. Unless otherwise noted, blank cells are due to unavailable math or reading assessment data. Assessment data are not available for any schools in one Partnership. Overall average includes only those Partnerships with non-Title II schools. The overall means for Title II school math scores, including Partnerships for which no non-Title II schools exist is 95.5, and the overall mean for Title II reading scores, including Partnerships for which no non-Title II schools exist is 94.3. Averages presented in this exhibit are sorted by average math difference. Numbers have been rounded.
EXHIBIT READS: A positive difference in the "Difference" column indicates that in a given Partnership, the average assessment score in all Title II schools is higher than the average assessment score in all non-Title II schools in Partnership districts. For example, on average, the Title II schools in the first Partnership row on the table score 9.6% higher on that state's math assessment than the non-Title II schools in the Partnership districts. Negative differences indicate the opposite, that non-Title II schools, on average, have higher assessment scores than the Title II schools.
SOURCE: School-Level Assessment Database. American Institutes for Research, John C. Flanagan Research Center (2001). Funded by the Policy and Program Studies Service, U.S. Department of Education

What Is the Role of the Formal Partnership Structure in Achieving the Goals of the Title II Partnership Grant Program?

The Partnership itself is the decision-making body governing the use of the funds and monitoring the processes and results of the collaboration. The Title II Partnership Evaluation is investigating the extent to which organizational changes and relationships among partners result in higher-quality preparation for preservice teachers and improved response to the needs of inservice teachers.

Elimination of Collaboration Barriers

Representatives from the various Partnership projects indicated that because of the formal Partnership structure, faculty from the schools of education and arts and sciences are "speaking the same language" for the first time because of the grant. Yet despite the support and resources provided to partner IHEs, representatives of both education and arts and sciences faculties reported that a number of challenges to the goal of involvement in Partnership activities remain:

- Lack of time for faculty from different departments to develop relationships (74 percent).

- Problems with arrangements, such as inability to schedule meetings convenient to all involved (62 percent).

- Reward system (such as salary, promotion and tenure) that recognizes neither faculty members' work in schools (56 percent) nor collaboration within the university (53 percent) or with K–12 schools (55 percent).

- Differences in culture between universities and schools (47 percent).

- Differences in climate between schools of education and arts and sciences (47 percent).

The Title II Partnership Projects have inspired an interest in and a purpose for collaboration. They have also provided the forum for diverse faculty to achieve consensus on goals for curricular and instructional reform. With a requirement for collaboration, these projects have also forced teacher educators to think more broadly about the larger responsibility for teacher preparation and to consider the pipeline as a continuum that stretches from early in a person's undergraduate career well into his or her induction phase of teaching and beyond.

Creation of New Alliances

The requirement of creating an advisory board has facilitated new alignments among business and cultural partners, IHEs and schools. Partnership advisory boards tend to comprise faculty and community leaders, deans of schools of education and arts and sciences, district superintendents and presidents of community colleges. In addition to leadership representation, most advisory boards include education and arts and sciences professors, district teachers and representatives from business and cultural partners.

A new partner sector represented on some advisory boards and in Partnership activities is the community college. Partner IHEs find that working with community college administration and education faculty may help potential teachers who want to get their teacher education start at local community colleges. Scholarship funds go further, in some cases, for students who are picking up part of the undergraduate requirements at community colleges. This academic and administrative collaboration requires a better

understanding of the population of students shared by both types of institutions and the content of the course work offered.

Distance and Partnership Structure

When large distances separate key higher education partners, strong partner arrangements are created on a local level, but collaboration with more distant partners may be hindered. Although advisory board membership promotes communication among a variety of institutions, meetings involving distant partners are often limited in their ability to affect the reform of teacher preparation.

For example, a number of Partnerships describe themselves as "statewide" in scope. Instead of being a unified, statewide entity, however, these Partnerships tend to break into regionally oriented collaborations, in which each regional IHE has developed its own strategies and activities. The level of interaction among these regional collaborations varies. One Partnership indicated that some partners in different cities had forged new connections, whereas another Partnership reported that partners at different regional sites have almost no communication.

Structure for Sustainability

Many Partnerships work with organizations and schools that have a long history of collaboration, although not all prior initiatives aimed at school reform or teacher preparation reform have been successful. By broadening the constituency, establishing mutually satisfying goals, making a commitment to continue reform, interaction, and professional development activities in the future and through sharing costs, Partnerships have at least started to explore the routes to sustainability.

Dean involvement in Partnership activities and initiatives, both among education and arts and sciences faculties, is on the rise, indicating university-wide support for teacher preparation. Exhibit 9 compares the percentages of faculty who reported support from their unit dean for Title II types of activities before and after the receipt of the Partnership grant.

The relative importance of support from the education and arts and science deans has significance as a means to accomplish several of the features of the Partnership Evaluation institutionalization framework: effective leadership to attract broad participation; reciprocal change in partnering organizations; legitimatization of change from individuals in leadership positions; establishment of a constituency in larger forums and monitoring impact. Education deans have a history of forming networks to realize reform; for example, UNITE for deans in urban universities and the Holmes Partnership for deans in large research universities. Arts and sciences deans work through both subject area and higher education organizations to address administrative and instructional issues. Within their own institutions, deans may be helpful in attracting the interest of other faculty and deans. Deans can commit their support to continuing Partnerships with schools and deans and to monitoring departmental resources; therefore, they may see both the benefits and the challenges of committing faculty and funds to institutionalize reform. At the same time, deans are aware of the larger academic context, such as state and accreditation requirements, and this awareness may influence their decision about support.

Exhibit 9
Percent of Faculty Reporting Dean Support before and during Second Year
of Partnership Implementation

	Education		Arts and Sciences	
Type of Support	**Percent Before Grant**	**Percent During**	**Percent Before Grant**	**Percent During**
Addresses issues of teacher preparation as a priority in speeches and strategic activities	79*	89*	51*	65*
Supports involvement of faculty in service to schools and collaboration with colleagues	82	89	72	81
Raises funds for faculty and unit activities related to school needs and teacher preparation	46*	62*	26*	25*
Provides release time for conducting research focused on K-12 school improvement or for participating in project activities	40	56*	29	38*
Asks participating faculty to make routine reports on project accomplishments at education or university-wide meetings	N/A	71*	N/A	42*
Attends Partnership governing board meetings	N/A	74*	N/A	43*
Highlights the importance of the Partnership in speeches, newsletters or other communications	N/A	79*	N/A	50*
Provides financial support for professional development activities related to Partnership activities	N/A	73*	N/A	57*

*$p<.05$, indicates significant differences between education and arts and sciences faculties in the mean proportion indicating support from the dean before or during the Partnership. For example, arts and sciences faculty differed from education faculty in perceptions of dean support for the first type of support listed "Addresses issues of teacher preparation as a priority in speeches and strategic activities" both before the grant began (79 vs. 51%, $p<.05$) and currently (89 vs. 65%, $p<.05$). For all significant differences, dean support was reported more frequently by education faculty than by arts and sciences faculty.
EXHIBIT READS: After receiving their Partnership grant, 89 percent of education faculty respondents to the faculty survey reported that their dean addressed issues of teacher preparation as a priority in speeches and strategic activities, compared to 65 percent of Arts and Sciences faculty, a significant difference.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Faculty Surveys

Partnership projects also have supplemented Partnership funds with money from other sources, another indication of sustainability. The grant program requires Partnerships to obtain matching funds from sources other than the federal government. These funds may include both monetary amounts and in-kind contributions. Project directors identified 66 matching-funds sources (an average of 2.75 funding sources in addition to the Title II grant per Partnership), all of which are committed for the entire 5-year grant period. The majority of cited funding sources are partner districts and departments within colleges and universities. To date, 9 percent of these sources have plans to continue beyond the grant, and more are expected to join the ranks of continuing funders. In addition, project directors reported that they continue to pursue alternative sources of funding from foundations, private individuals and corporations.

Partnerships described a variety of types of in-kind contributions. Most commonly, Partnerships receive in-kind contributions in the form of the time and salary of faculty and of school and district personnel. In addition, many Partnerships receive equipment, supplies and the use of facilities.

All project directors in the 1999 Partnership Grant cohort who responded indicated that reforms being put in place under the grant are being incorporated into the long-range or strategic plans of the partner districts and institutions. Exhibit 10 shows the number of project directors who indicated that specific reforms or activities are "very likely" to continue.

Exhibit 10
Project Directors Who Indicated Partnership Reforms and Activities
"Very Likely" to Continue

Reform Strategy	*Number of Project Directors*
Professional development schools	22
Support programs for beginning teachers	21
Cross-department working arrangements	20
Cross-department responsibility for teacher preparation	20
New techniques for assessing students in teacher preparation programs	20
New instructional strategies developed as part of the grant	20
New course sequences developed as part of the grant	18
Support for faculty involvement in schools and school districts	18
Data sharing about the recruitment of new teachers	16

EXHIBIT READS: 22 of the 25 project directors indicated that Professional Development
Schools were "very likely" to continue as a strategy of Partnership reform and activity.
SOURCE: Title II Partnership Evaluation Baseline Project Director Survey

School districts have a clear idea about the activities that should continue after the grant period but are in only the formative stages of planning strategies to achieve these goals. Some districts explain that institutionalization is difficult because of budget constraints and a focus on more pressing school problems. Other respondents report that partners who were supposed to take leadership roles in institutionalization efforts had not shared information with school district participants.

Future Data Collection

At the time of the writing of the Interim Report, the Title II evaluation was heading into its third year. During the third and fourth years, follow-up surveys for faculty and school district representatives will be fielded, and case study visits to five sites will be conducted. The surveys will seek specificity regarding the Partnership contributions and examine change over the life of the projects. The surveys and the site visits will be further informed by the newest literature about teacher preparation reform and qualified teachers.

Also in the third year, a survey enhancement will be directed toward the principals of elementary schools currently partnering with Title II Partnership institutions. In this data collection effort, increased focus will be given to the impact of the Partnership on improved teaching and student achievement.

For more information, please contact Dena Patterson, U.S. Department of Education, Policy and Program Studies Service, dena.patterson@ed.gov.